

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 6

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated May 28, 2004, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Passport in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,705 issued to Koneru et al. (hereinafter "Koneru").

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

This rejection is respectfully traversed because Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru does not teach or suggest all of the elements in Claims 1-20.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing information on a plurality of users to a plurality of requestors over the Internet. The method comprises, among other features, storing information on the plurality of users in a database located on a web server and associating the information with a plurality of keys, receiving a request at the web server for information on a particular user from a requestor over the Internet, and receiving a key associated with the request at the web server from the requestor over the Internet, the key associated with the request included in a cookie on a machine of the particular user wherein the key associated with the request was retrieved from the machine of the particular user by the one requestor.

36968/248469

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325  
Page 7

Applicant submits that Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru does not teach or suggest at least the steps of "receiving a request at the web server for information on a particular user from a requestor over the Internet" nor does Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru teach or suggest "receiving a key associated with the request at the web server from the requestor over the Internet, the key associated with the request included in a cookie on a machine of the particular user wherein the key associated with the request was retrieved from the machine of the particular user by the one requestor" as recited in Claim 1.

In contrast, Microsoft Passport teaches "there is no real-time server-to-server communication between participating Web sites and the central Passport servers. All information exchange occurs through the client's browser using HTTP redirects and cookies. The only server-to-server communication done by Passport Manager running on a particular site's servers is to periodically download a centrally hosted configuration file. This XML document contains current URLs for all the Passport servers and the current profile schema." (See "Single Sign-in [SSI] Service Overview" – Examiner numbered page 9.) As described in the references provided by the Examiner, Microsoft Passport uses the client browser (executing on the machine of a particular user) to communicate with both the central Passport servers (i.e., the web server) and the participating Web sites (i.e., the requestor). No real time server-to-server communication occurs between participating Web sites (i.e., requestors) and the central Passport servers (i.e., web servers).

Therefore, Microsoft Passport does not teach or suggest "receiving a request at the web server for information on a particular user from the requestor over the Internet" nor does Microsoft Passport teach or suggest "receiving a key associated with the request at the web server from the requestor" as recited in Claim 1. The addition of Koneru does not cure this deficiency.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru. Because they depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-8 and 14 are also patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru.

36968/248469

U.S. Serial No. 09/746,325

Page 8

Claim 9 recites "sending a query over the Internet from the requestor website to a web server for data associated with that key" and Claim 16 recites "a web server for receiving a request over the Internet from the requestor for information on a particular user." Because Claims 9 and 16 include elements that are similar to Claim 1, Claims 9 and 16 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru. Because they depend from Claim 9, Claims 10-13 and 15 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons advanced with respect to Claim 9. Because they depend from Claim 16, Claims 17-10 are patentable over Microsoft Passport in view of Koneru for at least the same reasons advanced with respect to Claim 16.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant submits that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

August 25, 2004

  
Anne Davis Barry, Registration No. 47,408

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 36192

36968/248469